

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No.: CR 06 547 CRB
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
RAMON COFIELD,)	<u>ORDER</u> (PROPOSED)
Defendant.)	

With the agreement of the parties in open court on October 4, 2006, and for the reasons set forth below, the Court enters this order excluding time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, from October 4, 2006, to October 18, 2006.

1. The parties have reached a negotiated resolution in this case that involves a resolution in a state court proceeding. Defense counsel needs additional time to investigate the state charges and the relationship to the federal sentence here, and requested a two-week continuance to accomplish this. Accordingly, on October 4, 2006, the Court set a new hearing date on October 18, 2006, at 2:15 p.m.

2. On October 4, 2006, the parties also agreed, and the Court held, that time should be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act until October 18, 2006. Failure to grant a two-week continuance until October 18 would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. §

3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The Court also finds that the ends of justice served by excluding the period from October 4, 2006, to October 18, 2006, outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See id. § 3161(h)(A).

3. Accordingly, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Clock from October 4, 2006, to October 18, 2006.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 19, 2006

STIPULATED:

DATED: 10/06/06

DATED: 10/06/06

CHARLES R.
United States District Judge

/s/ Mark Iverson
MARK IVERSON
Attorney for Ramon Cofield

/s/ Laurel Beeler
LAUREL BEELER
Assistant United States Attorney

